



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/622,360	07/17/2003	Wolfgang Kalthoff	2058.213US1	5356	
50400	7590	10/05/2007	EXAMINER		
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			DAILEY, THOMAS J		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2152			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	10/05/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/622,360	KALTHOFF ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas J. Dailey	2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-87 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/26/2007.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-87 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. The applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 40 and argues that the combination of Carter (US Pat. 5,418,945) and Fabbio (US Pat. 5,335,346) fail to teach the claims.
3. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited clearly in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. Further elaboration has been made with the specification objections and the U.S.C. 112 first and second paragraph rejections directed at these claims.
4. The applicant's arguments with respect to the amended independent claims 20, 33, 59, and 71 are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection presented in this office action.

Specification

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o).

Correction of the following is required:

6. The amended independent claims 1 and 40 recite, "the stored data set being stored in memory, the first entity having permission to change the unlocked data set and to view but not change the locked data set" (claim 1, lines 4-6; claim 40, lines 6-7) and "while providing access to the second entity...granting the first entity permission to modify the locked data set," (claim 1, lines 10-12; claim 40, 11-13). These two statements run contradictory to each other and are not clearly supported by the specification. The specification (specifically, the portions to which the applicant stated described these claim limitations, page 9, line 24-page 10, line 5) describes when the second entity receives a copy of the master data, it stores the received copy (clearly different than simply "providing access to the second entity") and only subsequent to the storing is the locked and unlocked data reversed in both the second entity and the first entity; not as the claims state "while providing access."
7. The amended independent claims 20 and 59 recite, "the permissions being included in the first subset of data" (e.g. claim 20, lines 6-7). The applicant points to page 7, lines 20-21 and page 8, lines 1-4 of the specification as supporting this

portion of the claims. The examiner did not find support for this limitation in that cited portion (it only states what type of permissions can be used in the systems and makes no mention of where the permissions actually are) or anywhere else in the specification.

8. The amended independent claims 33 and 71 recite, "the permissions being included in the master data [set]." The applicant points to page 7, lines 20-21 and page 8, lines 1-4 of the specification as supporting this portion of the claims. The examiner did not find support for this limitation in that cited portion (it only states what type of permissions can be used in the systems and makes no mention of where the permissions physically are) or anywhere else in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first and second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
10. Claims 1-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

11. Claims 1 and 40 recite, "the stored data set being stored in memory, the first entity having permission to change the unlocked data set and to view but not change the locked data set" (claim 1, lines 4-6; claim 40, lines 6-7) and "while providing access to the second entity...granting the first entity permission to modify the locked data set," (claim 1, lines 10-12; claim 40, 11-13). These two statements run contradictory to each other and are not clearly supported by the specification. The specification (specifically, the portions to which the applicant stated described these claim limitations, page 9, line 24-page 10, line 5) describes when the second entity receives a copy of the master data, it stores the received copy (clearly different than simply "providing access to the second entity") and only subsequent to the storing is the locked and unlocked data reversed in both the second entity and the first entity; not as the claims broadly state "while providing access."

12. Claims 20 and 59 recite, "the permissions being included in the first subset of data" (e.g. claim 20, lines 6-7). The applicant points to page 7, lines 20-21 and page 8, lines 1-4 of the specification as supporting this portion of the claims. The examiner did not find support for this limitation in that cited portion (it only states what type of permissions can be used in the systems and makes no mention of

where the permissions actually are) or anywhere else in the specification or the drawings.

13. Claims 33 and 71 recite, "the permissions being included in the master data [set]." The applicant points to page 7, lines 20-21 and page 8, lines 1-4 of the specification as supporting this portion of the claims. The examiner did not find support for this limitation in that cited portion (it only states what type of permissions can be used in the systems and makes no mention of where the permissions physically are) or anywhere else in the specification or the drawings.
14. Claims 2-19, 21-32, 34-39, 41-58, 60-70, 72-87 are rejected due to their dependence on the previously rejected claims.
15. Claims 1-19, 33-58, 71-79, 82-84, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
16. Claims 1 and 40 recites, "the stored data set being stored in memory, the first entity having permission to change the unlocked data set and to view but not change the locked data set" (claim 1, lines 4-6; claim 40, lines 6-7) and "while providing access to the second entity...granting the first entity permission to modify the locked data set," (claim 1, lines 10-12; claim 40, 11-13). These two

statements run contradictory to each other thereby rendering the claim indefinite. Moreover, the specification (specifically, the portions to which the applicant stated described these claim limitations, page 9, line 24-page 10, line 5) further confuses the intended scope of the claims as it describes when the second entity receives a copy of the master data, it stores the received copy (clearly different than "providing access to the second entity" and thereby illustrating the claims broad scope) and only subsequent to the storing is the locked and unlocked data reversed in both the second entity and the first entity, not as the claims broadly state "while providing access."

17. Claims 33 and 71 recite, "applying one or more of the operations and one or more of the applications indicated in the permissions to the unlocked data" (claim 33, lines 10-11; claim 71, lines 11-12). It is unclear how "applications" are applied to the unlocked data, as when read in light of the specifications applications are simply programs who have permissions to manipulate the data.
18. Claims 33 and 71 recite, "the unlocked locked data" (claim 33, line 7; claim 71, line 8). This limitation lacks antecedent basis.
19. Claims 2-19, 34-39, 41-58, 72-79, 82-84, and 87 are rejected due to their dependence on the previously rejected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 1-5, 7-34, 36-44, 46-72, and 74-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (US Pat. 5,418,945), hereafter "Carter," in view of Fabbio (US Pat. 5,335,346).

22. As to claim 1, Carter discloses a computer implemented method of sharing information, comprising:

defining a stored data set maintained by a first entity of computer system (column 3, lines 52-57) to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set(column 4, lines 25-33 and column 4, lines 52-58, database is stored at a server and a list is maintained the determines what data is accessible to whom), the stored data set being stored in memory, the first entity having permission to change the unlocked data set and to view but not change the locked data (column 4, lines 52-58, a server is subject to access (view) or write (able to change) restrictions on the data); and

providing a second entity with access to the stored data set (column 4, lines 25-33, the client is "the second entity), while providing access to the second entity: denying the first entity permission to change the data set (column 5, lines 18-26).

Carter does not disclose the second entity having permission to view the locked data set and to change only the unlocked data set and further while providing access to the second entity denying the first entity permission to change the unlocked data set while granting the first entity permission to modify the locked data set. Rather, in column 4, lines 53-58, Carter discloses the client (the second entity) being able to either access the database or write to the database. Therefore, the database that is accessed by the second entity is not broken up, i.e. a portion of it will be readable and the other portion will be writeable, but instead, in Carter, the entire database that is accessed by the second entity is treated the same way.

However, Fabbio discloses assigning file permissions to subsets of data (i.e. files in a file system) (column 3, lines 27-31 and column 8, lines 9-19, the file system of Fabbio is broken up into objects (data sets) and each object has associated permissions for either reading or writing).

Because both Fabbio and Carter teach methods for assigning and managing file permissions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of efficiently managing file permissions which allows for the restriction of computing resources for unauthorized users and systems.

23. As to claim 20, Carter discloses a computer-implemented method of sharing information, comprising:

defining a master data set in a first entity of a computer system, the master data set being stored in memory (column 3, lines 52-57);

assigning permissions, including permission to change a first subset of data within the master data set based on predetermined criteria, (column 4, lines 4, lines 52-58, permissions are assigned using password lists, one such password list being "a write password list");

transmitting a copy of the master data set (column 4, lines 25-33, the client reads on "the second entity") with indications of the permissions to the second entity (column 4, lines 52-58, password verification is the indication); and

receiving a manipulated master data set in accordance with the assigned permissions from the second entity, the manipulated master data set including a second subset of data resulting from a first subset of data being manipulated by the second entity using one or more of the operations and one or more of the

applications indicated in the permissions (column 5, lines 38-45, the client updates the master file group after it is finished working with it).

But, Carter does not disclose the permissions being included in the first subset of data within the master data set and indicating operations that a second entity may perform on the first subset data and applications that the second entity may use for manipulating the first subset of data. Rather, Carter discloses password lists for file groups and it is not explicitly disclosed that such file groups have further subsets of permissions assigned to each file or groups of files within the file group.

However, Fabbio discloses assigning file permissions to subsets of data (i.e. files in a file system) such permissions being included within the subsets of data (column 3, lines 27-31 and column 8, lines 9-19, "access controls assigned to the object").

Because both Fabbio and Carter teach methods for assigning and managing file permissions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of efficiently managing file permissions which allows for the restriction of computing resources for unauthorized users and systems.

24. As to claim 33, Carter discloses a computer-implemented method of sharing information comprising:

receiving, from a first entity of a computer system, a copy of a master data set with permissions for using the master data set, (column 4, lines 25-33 and column 4, lines 52-58, database is stored at a server and a list is maintained the determines what data is accessible to whom);

modifying the copy of the master data set according to the permissions to generate a modified copy of the master data set, wherein modifying includes applying one or more of the operations and one or more of the applications indicated in the permissions to the unlocked data (column 4, lines 29-33 and column 5, lines 38-45); and

transmitting the modified copy of the master data set to the first entity (column 5, lines 38-45).

But, Carter does not disclose the master data set including locked and unlocked data and the permission being included the master data. Rather, on column 4, lines 53-58, Carter discloses the client (the second entity) being able to either access the database or write to the database. Therefore, the database is not broken up, i.e. a portion of it will be readable and the other portion will be writeable, but instead, in Carter, the entire database is treated the same way.

However, Fabbio discloses assigning file permissions to subsets of data (i.e. files in a file system) such permissions being included within the subsets of data (column 3, lines 27-31 and column 8, lines 9-19, "access controls assigned to the object").

Because both Fabbio and Carter teach methods for assigning and managing file permissions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of efficiently managing file permissions which allows for the restriction of computing resources for unauthorized users and systems.

25. As to claim 40, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 1's rejection.

26. As to claim 59, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 59's rejection.

27. As to claim 71, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 33's rejection.

28. As to claims 2, 34, 41, and 72, Carter discloses a second entity with access to the stored data set includes providing an application in a computer system with

access to the stored data set (column 4, lines 6-11, the client computer system (the second entity) runs a client (an application) that has access to the data).

29. As to claims 3 and 42, Carter discloses providing an application in a computer system with access to the stored data set includes providing an application maintained at a location external to the first entity with access to the stored data set (column 4, lines 6-11, the client system is remote from the servers storing the master databases).

30. As to claims 4 and 43, Carter discloses providing a computer aided design system with access to the stored data set (column 4, lines 6-11 and column 4, lines 25-33).

31. As to claims 5 and 44, Fabbio discloses defining a stored data set maintained by a first entity to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set includes defining the locked data set to include information to call the application and the unlocked data set to include data to be used by the application (column 3 and lines 27-31, the invocation of an operation on an object reads on "call the application" and read correlates to "data to be used by the application").

32. As to claims 7 and 46, Carter discloses providing a second entity with access to the stored data set includes sending the data to the second entity (column 4, lines 25-33).

33. As to claims 8 and 47, Fabbio discloses providing the first entity with access to the stored data set, the first entity having permission to view the unlocked data set and to change only the locked data set (column 3, line 64-column 4, line 1, readable data reads on the unlocked data set and writeable data reads on the locked data).

34. As to claims 9 and 48, Carter discloses providing a computer aided design system with access to the stored data set (column 4, lines 6-11 and column 4, lines 25-33).

35. As to claims 10 and 49, Carter discloses providing a second entity with access includes providing an entity that is external to the first entity with access (column 4, lines 4-11).

36. As to claims 11 and 50, Fabbio discloses defining the stored data set to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set includes assigning data in the stored data set to the locked data set and an unlocked data set based on predetermined criteria (column 3, line 64-column 4, line 1).

37. As to claims 12 and 51, Fabbio discloses defining the stored data set to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set further includes defining the stored data set to include a restricted data set including data that is not part of the locked data set or the unlocked data set (column 3, lines 27-31, readable objects read on “unlocked data,” writeable objects read on “locked data,” executable objects read on “restricted data.”
38. As to claims 13-14 and 52-53, Fabbio discloses assigning data to the locked data set based on closeness criteria includes assigning data to the locked data set based on at least one of geometric closeness, organizational closeness (column 3, line 64 – column 4, 1, it is inherent that the grouping of “group ids” will be according to organizational closeness in any network, and collective closeness.
39. As to claims 15 and 54, Carter discloses assigning data in the stored data set to the locked data set and the unlocked data set based on a function of the second entity (column 4, lines 52-58, permission is based on function, either access or write functionality).
40. As to claims 16 and 55, Carter discloses defining data included in the unlocked data set for the second entity as locked for other entities (column 5, lines 21-26).

41. As to claims 17 and 56, Carter discloses defining data included in the unlocked data set for the second entity as locked for all other entities during a period of time when the second entity has access to the unlocked data set (column 5, lines 21-26).

42. As to claims 18 and 57, Carter discloses:

transmitting data from the stored data set to the second entity (column 4, lines 25-33);
receiving modified data from the second entity (column 5, lines 38-45); and
integrating the modified data corresponding to the unlocked data set into the stored data set (column 5, lines 38-45).

43. As to claims 19 and 58, Fabbio discloses defining the stored data set to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set based on user input (Fig. 9A, labels 901 and 903).

44. As to claims 21 and 60, Carter discloses receiving a modified copy of the master data set from the second entity and integrating the modified copy of the master data set with the master data set (column 5, lines 38-45).

45. As to claims 22 and 61, Carter discloses receiving the modified copy of the master data set includes receiving additional data (column 4, lines 29-33, the

editor on the client can "create new files," which will then be sent back as discloses in column 5, lines 38-45).

46. As to claims 23 and 62, Carter discloses receiving the modified copy of the master data set includes receiving changed data (column 4, lines 29-33 and column 5, lines 38-45).

47. As to claims 24 and 63, Carter discloses receiving changed data includes receiving data that has been changed in response to design considerations (column 4, lines 29-33 and column 5, lines 38-45).

48. As to claims 25 and 64, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes assigning authority to read data (column 4, lines 52-58, access password list reads on "authority to read data").

49. As to claims 26 and 65, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes assigning authority to change data that is a subset of the transmitted copy of the master data (column 52-58).

50. As to claims 27 and 66, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes assigning authority to add data (column 4, lines 29-33 and column 4, lines 52-58).

51. As to claims 28 and 67, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes assigning authority to delete data (column 4, lines 29-33 and column 4, lines 52-58).
52. As to claims 29 and 68, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes assigning authority to access predetermined types of data within the subset (column 4, lines 52-58).
53. As to claims 30 and 69, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes assigning permissions based on at least one of an identity of an entity, a function of the entity (column 4, lines 52-58, permission is based on function, either access or write functionality) and a user's position within the entity.
54. As to claims 31 and 70, Fabbio discloses assigning permissions according to a hierarchy within the second entity so that a highest ranking member of an entity has a greater number of permissions, and a number and extent of permissions decrease as rank decreases (column 9, lines 22-32, Fabbio system includes administration rights and that, inherently has a hierarchical structure).
55. As to claim 32, Carter does not disclose assigning different permissions for different subsets of *the master data set*.

However, Fabbio discloses assigning different permissions for different subsets of *the master data set* (unlocked data set) (column 3, lines 27-31 and column 8, lines 9-19, the file system of Fabbio is broken up into objects (data sets) and each object has associated permissions for either reading or writing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Fabbio in order to allow micromanagement of Carter's databases, i.e. allow the database to be treated as a collection of objects rather than just one.

56. As to claims 36 and 74, Carter discloses performing design processes on the unlocked portion of the data (column 4, lines 29-33).

57. As to claims 37 and 75, Carter discloses receiving permissions to do at least one of read, change, delete and add data to the unlocked data (column 4, lines 52-58).

58. As to claim 38 and 76, Fabbio discloses receiving the copy of the master data set with permissions based on subsets of the unlocked data, with different permissions assigned for different subsets of the unlocked data (column 3, lines 27-31 and column 8, lines 9-19).

59. As to claims 39 and 77, Carter discloses receiving the copy of the master data set with permissions based on at least one of an identity of the second entity (column 4, lines 52-58), a function of the second entity and a hierarchy of users within the second entity.

60. Claims 6, 35, 45, 73, 78-79, and 80-87, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter in view of Fabbio, as applied to claims 1, 20, 33, 40, 59, and 71, in further view of Sweeney et al (US Pat. 5,966,715), hereafter "Sweeney."

61. As to claims 6, 35, 45, and 73, Carter and Fabbio do not disclose defining version data for the application as the locked data set and defining raw data for the second entity to look at or use as the unlocked data. Rather, neither teachings get into specifics in regards to what the data sets comprise.

However, Sweeney discloses defining version data for the application as the locked data set and defining raw data for the second entity to look at or use as the unlocked data (column 8, line 66-column 9, line 15, the Version Control Manager has access (read only) to the version information (locked data or version data) and the rest of the application (unlocked data or raw data) can be executed or modified).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Fabbio with the teaching of Sweeney in order to give have the data represent something specific such as in version information which was disclosed in Sweeney.

62. As to claim 78 and 83, Carter and Fabbio do not disclose providing an application in a computer system with access to the stored data set includes providing a testing application with access to the stored data set.

However, Sweeney discloses providing an application in a computer system with access to the stored data set includes providing a testing application with access to the stored data set (column 12, lines 16-29, Sweeney's system includes means to test the databases and programs).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Sweeney in order to give Carter's system a specific function, such as the ability to test the applications.

63. As to claims 79 and 84, they are rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 78's rejection.

64. As to claims 80 and 85, Carter and Fabbio does not disclose receiving additional data includes receiving test results. Rather, Carter's additional data is generic and it does not specifically disclose the additional data's contents.

However, Sweeney discloses receiving additional data includes receiving test results (column 12, lines 16-29, the application is tested and new data is added to it and distributed to users). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Fabbio with Sweeney in order to give Carter's system a specific function, such as the ability to test the applications.

65. As to claims 81 and 86, Carter and Fabbio does not disclose receiving changed data includes receiving data that has been changed in response to testing.

However, Sweeney discloses receiving changed data includes receiving data that has been changed in response to testing (column 12, lines 16-29, the application is tested and new data is added to it and distributed to users). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Fabbio with Sweeney in order to give Carter's system a specific function, such as the ability to test the applications.

66. As to claims 82 and 87, Carter and Fabbio do not disclose modifying the copy of the master data set includes performing testing on the unlocked portion of the data.

However, Sweeney discloses modifying the copy of the master data set includes performing testing on the unlocked portion of the data (column 12, lines 16-29, the application is tested and new data is added to it and distributed to users).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Fabbio with the teaching of Sweeney in order to give Carter's system a specific function, such as the ability to test the applications.

Conclusion

67. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

68. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

69. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Dailey whose telephone number is 571-270-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday; 9:00am - 5:00pm.

70. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

71. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TJD
9/30/2007

Andrew Caldwell
ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER